

From: Kelley Chase/R3/USEPA/US
Sent: 4/24/2012 11:52:22 AM
To: Cynthia Caporale/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
CC: Richard Fetzer/R3/USEPA/US@EPA; Robin Costas/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: Re: HQs Comments on Week #4 Data Results

Cindy -

Here are the reports for HW-57 - not yet considered final since the review is ongoing.

Thanks for following up on this - Kelley

Tox Data Report w/ lab qualifiers Residential Data Reports

From: Cynthia Caporale/ESC/R3/USEPA/US
To: Kelley Chase/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Richard Fetzer/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Robin Costas/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 04/24/2012 11:25 AM
Subject: Re: HQs Comments on Week #4 Data Results

Kelley,

We are trying to verify the question about the rejected data. I don't see a final report file for HW57. Is this posted on the portal?

Cindy

Cynthia Caporale, Chief
OASQA Laboratory Branch
U.S. EPA Region III
Environmental Science Center
Fort Meade, MD
(410) 305-2732
Fax: (410) 305-3095

From: Kelley Chase/R3/USEPA/US
To: Cynthia Caporale/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Robin Costas/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Richard Fetzer/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 04/23/2012 11:26 AM
Subject: HQs Comments on Week #4 Data Results

Cindy and Robin -

Please see the attached comments from HQs regarding their review of the week #4 data. My initial responses are noted in red. Please review and provide additional feedback, as necessary. I will send a comprehensive response after I hear back from you.

Thanks - Kelley

----- Forwarded by Kelley Chase/R3/USEPA/US on 04/23/2012 10:59 AM -----

From: Terry Smith/DC/USEPA/US
To: Dawn Ioven/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Kelley Chase/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Janine Dinan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Scott Wesselkamper/CI/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 04/19/2012 03:20 PM
Subject: Week 4 sampling

Hi Dawn and Kelly:

As opposed to getting on a conference call, I thought I would just send you OEM's preliminary review of the Week 4 Dimock sampling results. We want to make sure that our review and any findings are consistent with those of Region 3. The issue of the third paragraph on the rejected data is really Region 3's call, as you are closer to the lab and the validation process. It just seems to me that with so many rejected values, I would just reject the whole semivolatile well head data set. Also, I just have a question as to whether there will be re-analysis of the samples for achieving lower reporting limits for lithium.

If you would like to have a call to discuss, that is fine. I can set something up. But if an email back is OK with you, its OK with us.

Terry Smith
202-564-2908

Data set review:

Well 03 contained methane in the original sample and a duplicate sample. Technically, the original sample contained methane at 15,000 ug/L and the duplicate at 28,000 ug/L which is equal to the trigger level. No response needed.

Well 57 contained Arsenic in the well head water at 5.8 ug/L which is above the trigger level of 4.5 ug/L but less than the MCL. Iron was detected in the well head at 11,2000 ug/L witch is higher than the secondary MCL and the trigger level. The Arsenic and Iron were not detected in the filtered sample or tap sample. It should be noted that there was a detectable amount of aluminum in the well head water that was well below the trigger level. Aluminum was also not detected in the filtered and tap water. The total suspended solids result was also relatively high (69 mg/L) in the well head sample compared to other well head samples. The Arsenic, Iron, and Aluminum were probably being carried in the water associated with the suspended particulates. This is the reason they were non detect in the filtered samples. Also, these metals and suspended particulates may have been trapped with an in-line house filter or treatment system, as they were not detected in the unfiltered tap samples. No response needed.

Also, the vast majority of semivolatile analyte results for the well head sample were flagged as rejected. Our opinion would be to reject the entire semivolatile analysis for the well head samples, as there is an obvious QA failure for this sample. All other analysis were fine.

Well 57 - as noted, many of the SVOC results were rejected. I recall that this had to do with recovery of the quality control samples. I am not certain why we would reject all data - if there where not issues with the quality control samples. However, I am out of my depth and will defer this comment to our lab folks.

We noticed that there are no results for Lithium in which a reanalysis has been made to achieve lower detection levels, as was done in the past weeks results. The reporting limit for Lithium is listed as 200 ug/L and there is a trigger value of 31 ug/L. The past re-analysis have been done in order to achieve a reporting level below 31 ug/L. We do not know if these will be, or are in the process of being reanalyzed to lower the QLs.

All of the samples were re-analyzed for the presence of lithium at the lower QL (25 ug/L). The results were not included in the last reports, since, at the time of the review, the data was not yet final. Including this data in the week #3 review seemed to cause some confusion. The results for all 61 locations (which are now considered final) will be provided for review in supplemental report(s).

